



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/607,397	06/30/2000	Damon Barry	13768.132	9886

22913 7590 03/18/2003

WORKMAN NYDEGGER & SEELEY
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

KISS, ERIC B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/607,397

Applicant(s)

BARRY ET AL.

Examiner

Eric B. Kiss

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 June 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 have been examined.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: "73" and "74", each in Figs. 2 and 3. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: "case" in line 2 should read --cases--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, and 4-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the TETware Release 3.3 software product (hereinafter TETware) released September 18, 1998 by The Open Group, as evidenced by: “TETware User Guide, Revision 1.2” (hereinafter TET_UG), “Release Notes for TETware Release 3.3” (hereinafter TET_RN), and “TETware Programmers Guide, Revision 1.2” (hereinafter TET_PG).

As per claim 1, TETware is disclosed with a computer system comprising: one or more test cases, wherein each of the test cases is a set of instructions for testing a feature of the computer program; a harness, wherein the harness is a set of instructions that executes each of the test cases on the computer program (test case controller; see sections 2.1 and 2.2 of TET_UG); a connector, wherein the connector is a set of instructions that selectively integrates a generic interface between the one or more test cases and the harness regardless of the language or format in which the test cases were written (test case managers and API libraries; see section 2.4 of TET_UG; see also section 2.4.4 of TET_PG describing the handling of non-API test cases); and a processor for executing the one or more test cases, the harness and the connector

Art Unit: 2122

(inherent in the operation of the UNIX and WINDOWS operating systems used to implement TETware; see section 1.1 of TET_UG).

As per claim 2, TETware is further disclosed with the set of instructions of the harness and the set of instructions of the connector utilizing an architecture that defines a means for accessing a resource over a network (see section 2.6.3 of TET_UG).

As per claim 4, TETware is disclosed with a method comprising: organizing one or more test cases into a hierarchy (test suite structure; see section 2.2 of TET_UG); interfacing a harness with the test cases, wherein the interfacing allows the harness to recognize and execute the test cases (test case controller; see sections 2.1 and 2.2 of TET_UG); and traversing the hierarchy to execute on a computer program one or more test cases selected by a user (see the description of the test case controller beginning on page 105 of TET_UG), wherein the selected test cases are executed on the computer program regardless of the language or format in which the test cases were written (test case managers and API libraries; see section 2.4 of TET_UG; see also section 2.4.4 of TET_PG describing the handling of non-API test cases).

As per claim 5, TETware is further disclosed with the step for traversing being performed by the harness (test case controller; see the description of the test case controller beginning on page 105 of TET_UG).

As per claim 6, TETware is further disclosed with the step for interfacing being performed by one or more connectors (see section 6.4 of TET_UG).

As per claim 7, TETware is further disclosed with a step of determining whether one or more of the test cases are identified as being deselected, wherein a deselected test case is not

Art Unit: 2122

executed on the computer program (see, for example, the “-n” command line option of the test case controller on page 107 of TET_UG).

As per claim 8, TETware is further disclosed with one or more test cases comprising a test suite in the hierarchy (see section 2.2. of TET_UG).

As per claims 9, TETware is further disclosed with one or more test suites comprising a test module in the hierarchy (test scenario; see section 2.2 of TET_UG).

As per claims 10 and 11, TETware is further disclosed with excluding test cases determined to be deselected from a selection of a test suite or scenario (see, for example, the “-n” command line option of the test case controller on page 107 of TET_UG).

As per claims 12-14, TETware is further disclosed with the step of traversing further including executing the selected test cases on a thread pool comprising one or more threads, and further discloses testing single-threaded and multi-threaded (thread-safe) models (see section 17.4 of TET_PG).

As per claims 15-17, these are computer-readable medium versions of the method discussed above (claims 4-6, respectively), wherein all limitations have been addressed as set forth above. Furthermore, the use of such a computer-readable medium containing executable code is inherently necessary for the operation of the UNIX and WINDOWS operating systems used to implement TETware (see section 1.1 of TET_UG).

As per claims 18 and 19, see the disclosure applied above in the rejection of claims 8 and 9, respectively.

Art Unit: 2122

As per claim 20, TETware is further disclosed with user-selected test cases (see the description of the test case controller and command line usage beginning on page 107 of TET_UG).

As per claims 21-23, see the disclosure applied above in the rejection of claims 12-14.

As per claim 24, TETware is disclosed with a method comprising:

employing one or more connectors to perform the acts of:

identifying one or more structural elements from a program module (invocable components); translating the identified structural elements into a hierarchy, wherein the hierarchy includes one or more series of instructions that test a feature of a computer program, and wherein the hierarchy groups related series of instructions (test cases); and interfacing the hierarchy with a harness (test case controller; see sections 2.1, 2.2, and 2.4 of TET_UG); and

executing the one or more series of instructions on the computer program, wherein the series are selected by a user and executed by the harness, and wherein the selected series of instructions are executed on the computer program regardless of the language or format in which the series were written (test case managers and API libraries; see section 2.4 of TET_UG; see also section 2.4.4 of TET_PG describing the handling of non-API test cases).

As per claims 25-27, see the disclosure applied above in the rejection of claims 12-14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over TETware and the associated cited documentation as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,342 to Hartmann et al.

As per claim 3, TETware is disclosed with such a system (see disclosure applied above to claim 1), but is not expressly disclosed with a COM technology architecture. However, Hartmann et al. teach a system for testing components that use middleware, such as COM/DCOM (see column 2, line 61 through column 3, line 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of TETware to include a COM architecture as per the teaching of Hartmann et al. One would be motivated to do so to gain the advantage of supporting and testing implementations in a standardized object-oriented middleware.

Art Unit: 2122

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric B. Kiss whose telephone number is (703) 305-7737. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri., 7:30 am - 5:00 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 22202, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

EBK
March 12, 2003


ANIL KHATRI
PATENT EXAMINER